Introduction

On 17 January the IISH organized an afternoon for teachers about Dutch involvement in slavery and colonial history. Those topics may be cause for agitation in the classroom. At the same time, scholarship advances continuously. How can scholars and teachers encourage discussion about these subjects? Matthias van Rossum and Klaas Stutje compiled instructional materials based on their research. Like other activities, this is once again intended to bring the IISH closer to society and make our research more relevant.

On 22 February the results of the portfolio evaluation were announced. Following the assessment by the evaluation committee in 2018, this marked another important step for the Institute. This evaluation had been requested by the government. The objective was to examine whether the academic infrastructure in the Netherlands meets current needs. The most important conclusion for the IISH was: ‘by combining academic research with (inter)national access to the collections, the IISH clearly enhances the national knowledge landscape. Because of both the size of the archive and the contingent of specialized staff required, the collections are best kept in a national institute.’ The ongoing cooperation for digital humanities in the HUC received praise as well.

On 8 March, International Women’s Day, nearly 200 people gathered at the Institute to attend the event ‘Love for the world: celebrating Rosa Luxemburg and Hannah Arendt.’ This gathering featured speakers expressing surprising views about these two women. Joke Hermsen and Brenda Ottjes were the driving forces. Other speakers included Marja Vuijsje, Ewald Engelen, Heidi Dorudi, Eva Rovers, Leo Lucassen and Pepijn Brandon.

On 20 March the NEHA had a big day, when Jessica Dijkman, secretary to the NEHA board, beat the gong to open the stock exchange. This ceremony marked the official transfer of the stock exchange collection to the NEHA, making a wonderful source on economic history available to the public.

On 10 April the undersigned was awarded his PhD degree for a history of the IISH. This work is covered in the lectures section of this issue. And finally I say farewell to On the Waterfront, as this is the last issue I produced. Aad Blok takes over as editor. Nataša van de Laar and Eric de Ruijter take on my other Friends tasks. Thank you all and see you around!

Huub Sanders

About the Friends

Members of the Friends of the IISH pay annual dues of 25, 100 or 500 euros or join with a lifetime donation of 1,500 euros or more. In return, members are invited to semi-annual sessions featuring presentations of IISH acquisitions and guest speakers. These guest speakers deliver lectures on their field of research, which need not be related to the IISH collection. The presentation and lecture are followed by a reception. The Friends coordinator may consult the Friends about allocation of the revenues from the dues and delivers an annual financial report in conjunction with the IISH administration.

As a token of appreciation for their great contribution to the Friends, Jaap Kloosterman and Jan Lucassen were appointed as honorary members in 2014.

The IISH was founded by master collector N.W. Posthumus (1880-1960) in the 1930s. For the past two decades, two of the institutions established by this ‘history entrepreneur’ have operated from the same premises: the Netherlands Economic History Archive founded in 1914 and the International Institute of Social History, which is now more than 80 years old. Both institutes continue to collect, although the ‘subsidiary’ IISH has grown considerably larger than its ‘parent’ NEHA. Additional information about the Institute may be found in Jaap Kloosterman and Jan Lucassen, Rebels with a Cause: Five Centuries of Social History Collected by the IISH (Amsterdam 2010). For all information concerning the Friends, see http://socialhistory.org/en/friends
Over five years of the Friends of the IISH in brief

The Friends of the IISH now figure integrally among the major events in and around the IISH. The organization set up in 2001 by Jan Lucassen, Jaap Kloosterman, and Mieke IJzermans and the format of two semi-annual meetings featuring presentations of interesting sections of new collections has proven its merits. The lectures were often exceptional and in some cases gave rise to interesting collaborative efforts, such as with the Volksuniversiteit (January 2016). The meeting in January 2017 dedicated to the Spanish Civil War was also very lively, including a memorable performance by Almudena Rubio.

The Friends were primarily intended as a club dedicated to financial support, especially toward collection development. To review the course of events within the Friends, I will chart the financial situation over the past five years:

### Friends of the IISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial chart</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>8.507</td>
<td>5.871</td>
<td>6.049</td>
<td>6.825</td>
<td>12.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>5.714</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>5.491</td>
<td>9.506</td>
<td>14.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the Waterfront; folder</strong></td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td>5.097</td>
<td>5.473</td>
<td>3.618</td>
<td>6.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH</td>
<td>6.500</td>
<td>8.300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>20.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR costs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank fees and exchange rate differences</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total general operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td>11.119</td>
<td>15.081</td>
<td>6.491</td>
<td>5.784</td>
<td>28.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result</strong></td>
<td>3.102</td>
<td>-8.130</td>
<td>5.049</td>
<td>10.547</td>
<td>-1.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Friends of the IISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Figures at 31-12-2017</th>
<th>Budget 2018</th>
<th>Figures at 31-12-2018</th>
<th>Budget 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available at start</td>
<td>14,069</td>
<td>24,616</td>
<td>24,616</td>
<td>29,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>5,506</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Laman Meijer bequest payable</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to provision for debtors</td>
<td>-2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>18,631</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>27,301</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New folder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Waterfront</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Waterfront</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>630</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants issued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH collections 2017</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH ANDB book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH ANDB book Laman Meijer bequest</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH TNI archive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH Pakhuis de Zwijger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IISH Olaf Hofland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaaper grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book &quot;Het Virus...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDB presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,849</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General operating expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write- off debtors</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR costs</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank fees and exchange rate differences</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,043</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>5,784</td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td>15,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance available</strong></td>
<td>24,616</td>
<td>24,591</td>
<td>29,373</td>
<td>23,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specification of available balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank balance</td>
<td>24,578</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payable reiskosten</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still available L. Laman Meijer bequest</td>
<td>-2,828</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends dues receivable</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24,616</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23,070</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This high amount is caused by the costs of the folder and invoices from 2017*
Hahn became renowned for his political cartoons in *De Notenkraker*. The drawings conveyed his struggle and protest. Hahn clearly condemned injustice and militarism.

During his period at the academy, Hahn drew many hundreds of political drawings and prints. These have been made individually accessible, and 600 drawings were added since the beginning of this year. All drawings by Hahn have now been described and digitized.

This material conveys the versatility of Hahn’s work and includes, for example, many early works he did during his time at the academy. Hahn was very studious and tended to do several studies of his subject before he was satisfied with a design or of drawing. The many studies of flowers and nudes are remarkable. The works show that Hahn mastered many styles and techniques.

Albert Hahn was raised in Groningen, in a working-class family of modest means. Due to poor health, he did not complete primary school. At age twelve, he apprenticed with his father, who painted houses and did decorative painting. The next year he enrolled at the Academie Minerva in Groningen, a course of study he interrupted for nearly two years for health reasons. Once his talent was noticed, he was awarded a grant to attend the Rijkschool voor Kunstnijverheid [State institute of applied art] in Amsterdam (1896-1900) and the Rijksacademie voor Beeldende Kunsten [State academy of visual art] in Amsterdam (1898-1901). An outstanding student, Hahn received three medals for his work. He also obtained certification as a secondary school drawing instructor, enabling him to teach drawing at a trade school in Amsterdam. In 1902 he started to work for the socialist daily *Het Volk*.  
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Presentation of the acquisitions
the interior of a classroom where he was taught. His depiction of the models, young, old, women, men, often holding a rod or a piece of fabric, is realistic but already conveys his playful style. In a drawing of a nude youth seated he added a small caricature portrait in the upper right corner (fig. 1).

The works recently made accessible include various designs featuring the ANDB logo, advocating an eight-hour working day. (fig. 2) The diamond workers trade union (ANDB), led by Henri Pulak, was the first to get the eight-hour working day introduced in the diamond industry in 1911. In October that year the diamond workers widely celebrated the eight-hour working day. The ANDB premises and diamond factories were decked with flowers, and the trade union organized several cultural demonstrations for the occasion. Based on the programme of these events in the IIISH collection, we know that the diamond workers also met in the auditorium at Artis zoo in Amsterdam. The photograph features the textile design by Hahn and the huge banner prominently displayed behind the stage (fig. 3).

Around 1913 Hahn drew several puppet figures, including one of Jan Klaasen [Translator’s note: Dutch version of Punch from Punch and Judy]. The drawing is part of a larger project. A friend of Hahn’s made real puppets, including one of the politician Kuijper, often depicted by Hahn in caricatures. Meetings of the SDAP featured performances involving this political puppet show. One of the topics was universal suffrage, written on a piece of wood that Jan Klaasen uses to box the ears of politician Kuijper in the performances.

The material that was recently made accessible also comprises two portraits of Karl Marx from 1915, in which Marx gazes at an industrial city. It would be interesting to know whether these drawings were issued or published as prints as well (fig. 4). (Harriet Stroomberg)

V.M. Bukhshtab Papers, from Prague with Resistance

In 2018 the IIISH acquired the personal papers of V.M Bukhshtab, a key figure in the anti-Bolshevik organization Krestianskaia Rossiia (Farmers’ Russia) (http://hdl.handle.net/10622/ARCH04573), from the British historian and collector Tobie Mathew.

This organization was associated with the PSR, the Socialist Revolutionary Party. Founded in 1900 and disbanded in 1921, the PSR was one of the main political parties in tsarist Russia during the first two decades of the twentieth century. The party supported revolutionary democratic reform-oriented socialism.

After the Russian Revolution of 1905 and its repression, many PSR leaders were forced to emigrate. The February Revolution of 1917 yielded new prospects. Party leaders, including Viktor Chernov, returned to Russia.

After the February Revolution, the PSR shared power with liberal and other democratic-socialist forces. Following the October Revolution, the PSR obtained a majority of the vote in the first democratic elections ever held in Russia, in which the Russian Constituent Assembly was elected. This soon proved insignificant in the changing politi-
cal climate. The Bolsheviks disbanded the Constituent Assembly in January 1918.

In late 1920 and early 1921, resistance by farmers against the grain supplies to the government escalated into a massive war of partisans. Especially Ukraine, Siberia, and the Northern Caucasus were hotbeds of resistance. In European Russia, farmers, deserters, and demobilized soldiers also launched attacks, albeit in smaller numbers.

Understandably, Soviet propaganda attributed the revolts by farmers to the Socialist Revolutionaries and their PSR. The Red troops fought back, all the way to the most remote areas, and by the spring of 1921 the Cheka had managed to crush the PSR.

The final defeat of the PSR in Russia followed the next year. In the summer of 1922, the first show trial took place, intended to stigmatize the PSR members as renegades. Their activities and ideas were associated with third ‘foreign’ powers, allegedly aiming to destroy the Soviet Union. Twenty PSR figureheads stood trial. It was the first show trial in the SU and the grand finale of the Civil War that had been raging since 1917. This trial definitely served as a model for later show trials.

The Krestianskaia Rossiia and its successor supported violent resistance within the Soviet Union in the late 1920s and early 30s. The extent and nature of these underground activities remain unclear. Still, these groups have been associated with various cases of political repression in early Stalinist Russia.

One morning in mid-September last year Huub Sanders rang me and asked ‘may I stop by? I have received a donation of a stack of drawings and prints by Fré Cohen.’ My interest was immediately piqued. Fré Cohen was a leading Jewish graphic artist from Amsterdam in the 1920s and 30s.

Huub had received the material from a woman from Australia who was in the Netherlands for just one week. She had been referred to the IISH, which already holds a large collection of AJC printed matter designed by Fré Cohen.

The woman making the donation turned out to be a granddaughter of Cor Bruijn, a novelist best-known for Sil de Strandjutter. Fré Cohen had briefly been in hiding with the Bruijn family in 1942. When Bruijn and Cohen met remains un-
clear. Fré Cohen designed the cover of Bruijn’s novel *Koentje van Kattenburg* (1937), published by Querido. They may have met via this publishing company.

The collection ended up with the granddaughter, who took the material with her, when she moved to Australia. The works are now back in Amsterdam and will soon be featured in our catalogue (Collection of free work and graphics by Fré Cohen).

Frederieka Sophia Cohen (nicknamed Fré) was born in 1903 in Amsterdam in a socialist Jewish family. After completing secondary modern, Fré studied drawing and art at the Amsterdam school of graphic arts. She joined the Arbeiders Jeugd Centrale (AJC) in her youth and produced nearly all printed matter for this socialist youth associations from 1922. From 1923 she worked on commissions from the socialist bookshop and publishing company N.V. Ontwikkeling, where she designed book covers and produced printed matter for the socialist newspaper *Het Volk*. Thanks to a grant, she attended Kunstnijverheidsschool [school for applied arts] Quellinus from 1927 to 1929, graduating with a diploma in Graphic Design.

From 1929 to 1941 she worked for the City of Amsterdam and designed virtually all printed matter. The rise of fascism and arrival of Jewish refugees made Fré Cohen more aware of her Jewish identity; this led her to produce illustrations for Jewish journals such as *De Vrijdagavond* and the *Nieuw Israëlitisch Weekblad*.

In 1941 and 1942 she taught graphic design and commercial art at the newly founded Middelbare Joodsche Kunstnijverheidsschool [Jewish secondary school of applied art] ‘W.A. van Leer’ (1941-1943).

From the summer of 1942 it became too dangerous for Fré, and she went into hiding. She stayed at many addresses. In June 1943 she was arrested by the SS at a farm in Borne. She committed suicide by swallowing poison. She had always said ‘they won’t take me alive.’

The new acquisition includes free work, consisting of city scenes and landscapes, still lifes, portraits, nudes in various techniques; and graphic designs, including book illustrations and designs for book covers.

She clearly cherished some works. One of the still lifes, depicting a vase of flowers, a small bust of a woman’s head, and a deer, attests to this, as it appears hanging on her wall in a photo taken inside her home.

The collection also comprises a charcoal portrait of Lion Contran (stage name of Lion Vleeschhouwer). Contran, who was a Jewish musician, was a communist and often performed at venues where the CPN met. He also made a living by teaching private music lessons, and Cohen was one of his students. As she painted several portraits of him and had kept one on the wall in her home, she must have had close ties with him.

My mother and aunt, also raised in Jewish
family active in the CPN, happen to have taken piano lessons from Lion Contran as well! In his entry in my aunt’s autograph album, he predicted she would have a musical career, signing as ‘Uncle Lion.’ My aunt did in fact attend the conservatory and became a professional pianist.

In January 1936 Cohen wrote an article for the journal wij about the Swiss village of artists Ascona, where she spent some of her holidays. The six illustrations she did of the setting appear in the collection.

This lovely donation sheds new light on the impressive oeuvre and life story of the immensely productive Fré Cohen. (Harriet Stroomberg)

'A Soviet-Marxist Party Institute,' the SDS and ASO Marburg archives

Marburg played a special role in the leftist movement in Germany in the 1960s and 70s. This is thanks largely to the special role of Wolfgang Abendroth, a professor there, in the left wing of German social democracy. Like many German institutions, the Philipps Universität in Marburg had to account for its Nazi past after 1945. In 1866 the city and University had come under Prussian control and were not known as progressive before 1933 either. Nor did the Führerprinzip introduced in 1933 or the war that Germany started after 1939 help the university. One of the many initiatives after 1945 to transform Germany into a nation with democratic rule of law was the introduction of three chairs for ‘academic policy’ by the Hessen state government under the aegis of spd minister Christian Stock. These chairs in ‘Demokratiewissenschaft’ [scholarship of democracy] were initiated in 1948 in Darmstadt, Frankfurt, and Marburg. Abendroth held the position in Marburg from 1951.

In the postwar period the SDS, the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund, was an important student organization of the spd in Germany. The organization was often at the far left of the party spectrum. Members strongly opposed the nuclear arms race and remilitarization of the FRG. By the late 1950s tensions mounted between the spd and the SDS. In 1959 the spd adopted the Godesberger Programm, abandoning its Marxist roots and becoming an ordinary progressive party, while the SDS radicalized during these same years. The SPD and SDS clashed for instance over an action and exhibition organized by the SDS on Nazi lawyers who were free to resume practising law in the FRG. Götz Langkau participated in this campaign as a student. Tensions ran so high that in 1961 the spd decided that membership of the SDS was incompatible with that of the spd. In these years Abendroth had actively opposed the course of the SPD. Because of his involvement with an organization that supported the SDS in 1961, he was expelled from the party.

In the 1960s the SDS was very active in Marburg, campaigning ever more energetically against the Notstandsgesetz throughout the decade. This act gave the state extensive authority to intervene in crisis situations. A longstanding
Sexual liberation or a sexual expression of art and life: The Bill Levy papers

We like to think of the 1960s and 70s as an era of sexual liberation. Not everybody felt this way at the time. In 2018 the iish acquired a large accrual to the personal papers of Bill Levy. This archive contains material on the activities of Levy during the late 1960s and early 70s, when he published the periodical Suck: First European Sexpaper and organized the Wet Dream Film Festival (WDDF). The first part of the archive arrived back in 1974.

William (Bill) Levy (1939) was an American writer, editor, and radio host, who reached Amsterdam via London. In Amsterdam he published Suck and organized the WDDF. He was very down to earth about it, regarding it primarily as a fun and personal obsession. In his view, it was more about art and literature with sex as a theme.

A total of eight issues of Suck were published, plus the special issue The Virgin Sperm Dancer. It started in London in 1969, where Levy found several kindred spirits in the hippie scene. All were interested in sex and free love, including Heathcote Williams (poet/playwright), Jean Shrimpton (model/actress), Jim Haynes (theatre man), and Germaine Greer (writer). In Amsterdam he approached Willem de Ridder for design and production. The first issue came about overnight and met with great acclaim, but the English authorities were not amused. Almost immediately they tried to seize everything and shut down their operation. Because production was partly in the Netherlands, the English were unable to stop Levy, but they did force him to leave.

Known as Magical Centre, Amsterdam was a logical step. At the time tolerance was greater there, and teaming up with De Ridder was fruitful. The next issues also sold well. Many readers contributed letters and photos and found the publication very appealing. Hebdo artists such as Willem, Sine, and Wolinski contributed, and Van der Elsken, Pontiac, and Van den Boogaard participated from the Netherlands. Levy was also in touch with the Beat generation, including William Burroughs.

Levy had a field day, he was free to publish without restrictions. Even subjects such as incest, paedophilia, and bestiality could be addressed. Some editors, however, wanted the contributions to focus more on raising awareness and on liberation. Especially Germaine Greer, who had just published The Female Eunuch, ultimately had a falling out with Levy over this and stopped working with him. In 1973 the editors decided to produce one final issue.
The early issues of *Suck* coincided with the plan to organize a film festival in Amsterdam. In December 1970 the first *Wet Dream Film Festival* (WDFF) was held, and the second followed in October 1971. In the spirit of *Suck* sex films were screened, once again without any restrictions. While much was permitted in Amsterdam, such an overt festival of sex films could lead to police inspections and supervision. The foundation self. Sexual Egalitarian and Libertarian Fraternity was established in response. Whoever wanted to attend the festival had to register as a member and was issued a membership card. The registrations are in the archive, circa 400-500 per festival.

The festival took place near Leidseplein, at the Leidseplein Theatre, Paradiso, and the Lido. In addition to motion pictures, there was a party, and there were performances, theatre, music, and dancing. The event was hugely attractive to the ‘scene,’ many counterculture and alternative figures converged. Not only from the Netherlands, but also international happening artists, such as J.J. Lebel and Otto Muehl.

The winner at the first WDFF was a motion picture by the Japanese-Dutch artist Tajiri, about a Danish girl who felt better with the animals on her farm than with people. His effort to depict her human qualities was covered but received far less consideration than her sexual preferences. Tajiri later regretted his submission to the festival. This case once again revealed the conflict over whether the festival was specifically about sexual liberation or a more general feeling of freedom and happiness.

The archive consists mostly of photos and correspondence. Much of it was published in *Suck* or used at the Festival. The collection nicely complements other *Suck* collections of alternative movements from the 1960s and 70s. Levy may have experienced it as a personal obsession, but it fits perfectly with the spirit of the times. (EDR)

**Rust en Werk Plantation in Suriname and the abolition of slavery**

In late 2018 the NEHA, the Netherlands Economic-History Archive, received a great many archive documents concerning the plantation *Rust en Werk* [rest and work] along the Commewijne River in Suriname (http://hdl.handle.net/10622/ARCH04720). In recent years other documents on Suriname have been purchased, e.g. handwritten Surinamese colonial reports from the period 1863-1876. See: *On the Waterfront* 31 (2016), pp. 4-5.

Plantation *Rust en Werk* was built around 1750 by Wigbold Crommelin, who arrived in Suriname as commander of the troops in 1749. One of the first owners was Pieter Constantijn Nobel, who entrusted management of the plantation to administrator J.F. Andree. In 1808 Theodor Gülcher became the owner.

*Rust en Werk* started as a coffee plantation but was gradually converted to cultivate cotton. *Rust en Werk* grew to be one of the most profitable cotton plantations in Suriname.

After Theodor Gülcher died, his son Pieter Constantijn took over the plantation at first and then his nephew Jan Marie. By then the plantation had switched from cotton to sugar. The Gülchers had good connections with sugar companies in the Netherlands Indies and could draw on sufficient knowledge. In 1934 this ended, and the company was wound up. In 1947 *Rust en Werk* was merged with other plantations, and cacao was produced for the Rotterdam confectionary company Jamin for decades.

The documents acquired are all from the nineteenth century. The auction catalogue captures the quality of this archive concisely as: ‘All in all, this archive gives a detailed, apparently complete, and valuable insight in the goings on on a Surinam plantation in general and *Rust en Werk* in particular.’

Which documents are in the archive, and who were the operators? Pieter Constantijn and Jan Marie Gülcher ran the plantation from their home base in Amsterdam. They signed documents and sent them to Pieter Slijgher, a lawyer in Monnikendam, co-owner of the plantation, and representative of various other family members and co-owners. Most documents are stamped ‘Familie-Archief Pont,’ which for the moment seems to refer to the Pont family of regents from Edam.

First, there are 4 volumes of account ledgers from 1834-1860 and 1871-1886. They reflect concise annual balance sheets for the years 1834-1860. The Income and Expenditures registers from the years 1871-1886 are far more detailed and disclose both the ‘Sugar preparation costs’ and those of the ‘Medical Service’ and ‘Maintenance of Buildings, Factories and Vessels’ and, very importantly, the ‘wages for labour.’ Income also comes from ‘Sugar,’ ‘Dram’ or ‘Rum,’ ‘Molasses,’ and ‘Bananas’.

In addition to these account ledgers, the archive comprises over one hundred letters and individual bills regarding the plantation *Rust en Werk*.

One remarkable item is a letter dated 6 Janu-
ary 1872 from Pieter Constantijn Gülcher and Charles le Chevalier in Amsterdam ‘To the owners of the Plantagién Rust en Werk in Suriname. Here and in Monnikendam.’ They argue that ‘the question of where to find satisfactory workers is vital for the prosperity and continuity of the colony of Suriname in general and this fine Plantation Rust en Werk in particular, after State supervision ends in July 1873’.

On 1 July 1863 slavery was abolished. For the time being, this did not give rise to true freedom. ‘State supervision’ continued for ten years. During this time, plantation slaves were required to remain on the plantations as contract workers. As such, former slaves received contracts for one, two, or three years on the plantation of their choice. Planters were required to provide these workers placed under state supervision with housing, medical care, and a plot of land to cultivate.

Both gentlemen then explained that ‘A serious reduction in the income of Sugar and Banana cultivation on this Plantation’ was to be avoided. Next they advocated recruiting 80 workers from Barbados. They already had some, and they were good workers.

Another letter is dated 30 August 1872 and is also from Gülcher but is addressed to Sligher, the lawyer in Monnikendam and joint owner of Rust en Werk. The tone is the same: state supervision is about to end, most former slaves are expected to stop working at that point, and one ‘hundred’ ‘immigrants’ need to be ‘ordered’ from ‘Bengal,’ is their suggestion. Barbados, Bengal! Following the abolition of slavery, the colonial economy entered a new era. (BHi)
Friends of the IISH Lectures, 31 January 2019

My journey into the history of the wondrous IISH

Lecture by Huub Sanders

The start of my dissertation title “Het virus der betrokkenheid” is quoted from a short article by Eric Fischer in a collection presented as a farewell gift to board members Wieringa and De Wolff in 1991. When I read it in 1991, it struck me as an apt characterization of what I experienced in all aspects of working at the IISH. It is not just any Institute, ‘involvement’ is pivotal. I will briefly cover the highlights of this history. Next, I will review the problems I encountered and will describe my personal motivation, concluding by examining whether such a study is relevant, and whether we can learn anything from it. First, very briefly: what does the history of the IISH involve in my view?

The history of the IISH is best captured as that of a changing group of people that were affected both by the problem of the social issue and by the history of that problem. Founder Posthumus, for example, was a passionate socialist student around 1900, convinced of the historical necessity of socialism to overcome the wrongdoings of capitalism. He was also imbued with the scholarship method of the German Historical School and historical materialism for examining social phenomena in present and past. He did this in his dissertation on the textile industry in early modern Leiden. At the time he belonged to a group of students and young scholars who largely embraced socialist views. These people gradually obtained permanent positions in society and as scholars. Posthumus built institutions within this context, founding the NEHA and the EHB. His original inspiration persisted. In the mid-1930s, combined with the political crisis instigated by fascism, this culminated in the IISH. This institution was then exposed to three forces: academic research, scholarly infrastructure, and society.

I examined 5 periods between 1935 and 1989 to analyse which of those three forces had the greatest influence on the course of the Institute. And that often requires tracing the progression in the views of that changing group of people, even though their commitment to the IISH arose from comparable motivations, and the composition of this group changed over time as well. Over the course of those 5 periods, ‘scholarship’ and ‘infrastructure’ increasingly influenced the course the Institute took.

The first five years were dedicated to rescuing archives and libraries from the threat of fascism. Scholarly endeavours were modest. The Institute operated independently.

During the Second World War the malicious Nazi political regime was in control, and the institution collapsed. But the idea of the IISH endured. Infrastructural continuity was preserved by the tiny branch at Oxford.

In the reconstruction period of 1945 to ’65, scholarship and infrastructure became more important. Social democracy became a foundation of the welfare state. But the Institute was seriously short of funds. To embed it more firmly, rapprochement with universities was initiated via an Inter-University Institute.

In the period 1965 to ’79, the influence of society was strong, while that of scholarship and infrastructure remained modest. Growth finally resumed; new sections and departments were formed, and collections expanded. Democratization of universities also gave the IISH a council structure, but the organization almost stagnated.

In the third period, from 1979 to ’89, the influence of society declined, while that of scholarship and infrastructure grew. The KNAW appeared and demanded a reorganization; Efficiency improvements became the focus. Some independence was lost.

These charts and forces are indicative: this is not an exact science, this concerns a qualitative assessment of the importance of vast sectors influenced by many different mechanisms. I have conveyed only the first and last periods in these charts.

These informative charts are by Hans Drieman. I did not consider this development haphazardly but from the perspective of the professionalization of the scholarly and collecting activities of the IISH. By the end of the period I reviewed...
(1989), the iish had become an established professional collection and research institution progressing from an organization where many amateur scholars from the movement were active to an established institution.

Which problems did I encounter in this research? Every study requires choices. How do you examine your subject? If you do not restrict your scope, it will quickly expand, especially with a subject like ‘the iish.’ For instance the history of views on preserving personal papers or how labour history as a discipline relates to the social history discipline overall. Or you can easily lose your way in the spectacular histories about people on the run with their collections from repressive regimes with their secret services or the wondrous postwar restitution of collections.

Another practical restriction frequently challenges most historians: the abundance of sources. The section of the iish archive that is accessible already spans 166 metres! My main sources comprising the Stichting iissc board minutes and meeting documents are already so vast that I had to select here too. I definitely could not make full use of directly adjacent sources, even within the iish Institute archive, disregarding sources at the Ministry of Education, Culture & Science, the KNAW, or the University of Amsterdam.

I faced time constraints as well. I started in 1979-1989. I received support from the iish in terms of research hours, but I invested a lot of my own time as well.

Investing my time guided my personal motivation. Both very long ago, as a reason for wanting to work at the iish and, later on, in writing its history. I was a student in the 1970s and participated in the Leiden student movement. I have always been interested in the struggle against prevailing views in society and scholarship. At the time it was captured in terms such as ‘confrontation study’ and ‘history of the ordinary people.’ In Leiden I co-founded the HAK, the Historische Aktie Komitee, together with Sjaak van der Velden and others. The ideology of the movement needed to be preserved for the future and to be universally available. The best way to accomplish this was at an institute with the background and history of the iish, as that was what I encountered as a student. That the archives of Marx were preserved there fascinated me. Making everybody visible in history has always seemed equitable and necessary to me. Workers, farmers, women, etc. Recently I saw this conveyed in the adage of a club in England called Working Class History: ‘History isn’t made by kings and politicians, it is made by us: the billions of ordinary people. This project is for our, often forgotten, history.’ This aligns closely with my own opinion in the late 1970s. Although I remain partially convinced of this, I would now write ‘History isn’t made only by kings and politicians, it is also made by us: the billions of ordinary people. This project is for our, sometimes forgotten, history’. I believe I have mitigated my views with the passing of time, but also because of the interest that historians have been expressing in aspects of history other than kings and politicians for many decades. In virtually all historical sub-disciplines, history scholars have long shown interest in all aspects of ordinary people.

Of course this happens mainly in social history and women’s history, as well as in cultural and economic history. That trend has always figured throughout the discipline, and an Institute such as the iish has always played a role here, and still, when I consider attention to slavery and migration.

The above explains my personal motivation. Does my research encompass a broader scope? I believe it is relevant at two levels. Briefly stated regarding the institution, I believe that, when you spend day after day exploring, for example, EAD or HUC or Archivematica or CLARIAH or ES- HIC, HISCO or the ISHC, this research helps you realize that your work revolves around the desire to generate information and historical knowledge about the social issue, and that such knowledge is necessary to tackle that issue. Both then and now.

More broadly: can we learn anything general from this history? The blunt reply is of course both yes and no. It helps you observe your own actions more carefully. But none of those lessons is directly applicable. ‘Learning lessons from history’ is never straightforward. In my opinion ‘history’ is a reflective discipline, and reflection is necessary to achieve anything at all. Knowledge from scholarship is produced in institutions of scholarship, which in most cases find their origin in social revolutions or a social problem. This gives rise to objectives for the practice of your activities. I am also convinced that forgetting your history leads you to forget your objectives and eventually to lose your relevance. Not knowing your history ultimately makes you lose sight of who you are, and why you exist. Then you will wind up on the rubbish dump of history. That is why the final sentence in the final conclusion in my thesis reads: ‘Throughout the entire period, the central driver of the Institute was the desire arising from involvement in exploring and historically documenting ‘the social issue’. As long as this involvement motivates professionals, research and collecting at the iish will remain socially relevant.’
IAV and IISH

Lecture by Annette Mevis

Annette Mevis is archivist at Atria. She has worked closely with many at the iish in a wide variety of collection fields, including restitution matters, and has written about the origins of the iav collection and about the shared history of iav (the precursor to Atria) and iish.

Dear Friends of the IISH,

Dear Huub,

Thank you for the invitation, and many congratulations on completing your dissertation. You have asked me to ‘reflect’ on your research, from my personal and professional background and ties with the IISH, with ‘all freedom … to raise anything at all’.

I have already had the opportunity to read your dissertation, in which you cover the period 1935-1989. Because except for one year in that period what is presently the Atria, a think tank on emancipation and women’s history was called the International Archive for the Women’s Movement (abbreviated IAV), I will refer to the IAV here.

Reading your dissertation greatly enhanced my understanding of the history of the IISH. I was aware of some matters, had a partial idea of others or none at all, or knew about them only from the perspective of the IAV. I read fascinating stories, such as the one about the Spanish crates. And that the IISH set up a separate, professional archives section only in 1974.

And although I knew about it, I was struck by the substantial differences between the two institutes (IISH and IAV) in terms of scope, size, financial means, and power; how the IISH is far more established and has more staff and greater networks and is more connected and embedded. The enormous amounts paid for some of the collections (e.g. 72,000 guilders for the Marx-Engels archive in 1938) caught my attention as well.

In addition the similarities are remarkable. In the story you sketch, the terms workers’ movement and women’s movement, history of the workers’ movement and history of the women’s movement are interchangeable in some cases.

In your first chapter you describe the rise of social history as a discipline and explain that aside from becoming a field of scholarship and the political commitment, ‘forgotten groups’ kept being discovered: workers, women, young people, students, marginalized groups, migrants, slaves. (p. 35)

There is one major difference in this list of ‘forgotten groups.’ All groups you mention include women, and as a group they are much larger than all those others, they are half the population. From the origins of women’s history in the Netherlands, in the early 1970s, feminist historians, scholars of women’s history, in addition to conducting research on women and their movements, therefore also called for greater attention for and integration of women and gender in all branches of history.

In his study, Huub acknowledges the pivotal role of IISH founder N.W. Posthumus. As this is a gathering of Friends of the IISH, I’ll say a few words about the relationship between the two institutes and the importance of Posthumus and the IISH for the IAV.

From 1935 until 1981, the IAV was housed at the IISH, for 46 years, after starting out at the former secondary school for girls at Keizersgracht 264 and ending up at Herengracht 262. The IISH supported the IAV throughout by providing accommodations and from 1935 until 1953 granted 600 guilders in funding every year as well.
These close ties between the two institutes were not sheer coincidence but arose directly from the connections that the IAV founders had with Professor Posthumus. How did they come about?

First Johanna W.A. Naber (1859-1941)
Posthumus knew Johanna Naber at least since 1913, as they were both members of the Historical Committee that organized the exhibition ‘De Vrouw 1813-1913.’ On this topic, Huub writes that Posthumus (p. 69) was aware of and favourably disposed toward the effort of women to improve their plight.

Johanna Naber was a remarkable scholar of history. Although she lacked a university education (her father did not let her attend university), she published a vast historical oeuvre that was acclaimed by professional historians. Nearly all her historical work is about women between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries. She never explicitly criticized fellow historians about their blind spot regarding women but in her own work showed them what they had overlooked. In 1935 J.W.A. Naber was one of the three signatories of the deed establishing the IAV. On a draft of the articles of association, she adds an interesting remark ‘Further to the content, I believe that regarding the logical connection between Art. 1 and Art. 8 the connection between the new Foundation and the Institute of Social History in art 1 needs to be stated more clearly. I therefore propose that Art. 1 read as follows: The Foundation ’International Archive for the Women’s Movement,’ subsidiary institution of the IISH ……’

This proposed amendment was not approved.

Rosa Manus (1881-1942) had a different view of the matter. Professor Posthumus also knew Rosa Manus since at least 1913, because she and the Amsterdam feminist Mia Boissevain organized the mentioned Exhibit ‘De Vrouw 1813-1913,’ which Posthumus facilitated.

In Chapter 2 of his dissertation, Huub Sanders provides a more complete account of the actions of Posthumus than we had to date and reveals that Posthumus was interested in ALL collections relating to social and economic history. His interests included the collection on the international women’s movement that Rosa Manus had been developing since 1908, when she became active in this movement. In the early 1930s Posthumus asked Manus whether she would agree to transfer her library to the Economic-History Library. She refused: she did not want to have her books and archive materials ‘submerged’ in another institute, even though the accommodations and care they had there would be impeccable.

When the IISH was founded a few years later, Posthumus told Manus that the board would allocate some rooms to set up a separate library. Manus felt differently about that offer and was interested in a separate foundation.

The third is not Willemijn Posthumus-van der Goot, the third signatory of the establishing deed, an economist, from 1920 the lover of Professor Posthumus (as Huub has discovered) and from 1931 his lawful wife, but Jane de Iongh (1901-1982), also involved in founding the IAV and a board member from the outset. She was one of the 2 women – in addition to 68 men – who served on the IISH board in the period 1935-1989, as Huub notes in his conclusion (p. 299). Unlike Naber, Jane de Iongh was a professional historian – she took her PhD in 1927 and started working at the Netherlands Economic-History Archive in 1938, together with Posthumus. At the time she was one of the ten professional Dutch historians (and the only woman) specializing in business history.

Unlike Johanna Naber, De Iongh did find fault with the work of male historians, harshly criticizing the content of Dutch historical scholarship. Huub writes that at the very first IISH board meeting on 23 December 1935 – at which collection policy was discussed – De Iongh argued ‘that the black race had been forgotten.’ Elsewhere, she defines history as ‘man’s recollection of his own grandeur’.
I will conclude by taking this opportunity to mention a few iish people with whom I have had extensive contact (my list is definitely not complete):

Atie van der Horst worked 3 hours a week on the archives when I joined the iav in 1983; she took me under her wing, when I attended Archive school; she thought of following the example of the iissi by issuing an Overzicht van de Archiven.

Over the years Jack Hofman has been helpful in all kinds of ways, as Marja Musson, Erhan Tuskan, Hans Drieman, Frank de Jong, Afelonie Doek and Marien van der Heijden later became as well.

Last but not least, Jaap Kloosterman, was always willing to help and come up with ideas; thanks to Jaap, we obtained microfilms in 1994 of the iav archives that were stolen in WWII and ended up in Moscow – and of which the originals returned to Amsterdam only in 2003.

But that is a separate story.

Huub, once again, congratulations on your fine thesis, and thank you for listening.

Women’s work and the virus of involvement

Lecture by Ariadne Schmidt

Ariadne Schmidt is professor at Leiden University by special appointment in the history of urban culture, especially of Leiden. The iish has figured prominently in her career. She ran the research project ‘Women’s Work in the early-modern period’ from 2002. This project was co-financed by the Friends of the iish. In 2001 she took her PhD on Overleven na de dood. Weduwen in Leiden in de Gouden Eeuw [Survival after death. Widows in Leiden in the Golden Age].

As announced, Huub invited referees who interacted extensively with the iissi from a certain perspective. My perspective is ‘history of women’s work’ and ‘working women at the iissi.’ As I hope to make clear, those two groups have been very closely intertwined throughout the history of the institute. This afternoon, I will highlight a few parallels between your analysis of the institute and the development of my own discipline.

You examine how the iissi professionalized at the intersection of (1) Scholarship, (2) Society, and (3) Infrastructure.

That model also conveys the description of the development of women’s history, or rather the history of women’s work. Social developments were important in the emergence of women’s history, which began as an emancipatory project, closely linked to the second feminist wave in the 1970s. Infrastructure, the distribution of work among institutes, influenced where women’s history was practised.

Of course, the academic discipline guided questions asked within the research as well.

You qualify the history of the iissi as the history of a changing group of people who were simultaneously affected on the one hand by the social issue and on the other hand by the history of that issue. This changing group of people includes women as well.

Among the four important topics that Peter Burke mentions for studying social history is gender, as manifested in the attention devoted to a small number of important women in the men’s world that the iissi was.

The librarians were especially influential. Only two women served in the board in the period you examined. The gender ratio was more balanced in positions lower in the hierarchy, as we read in your book. You mention the unequal distribution between the number of men and women at the iissi as one of the tenacious ‘embedded practices.’

That observation concerns the 1980s, aptly conveying that the embedded practices of the iissi as a men’s world had not entirely disappeared after 2000 and surface in informal nomenclature. As you are aware, conference rooms here have been named after key figures. We are now in the Posthumus Room. Adjacent is the Scheltema Room. Women were not forgotten, but the naming practice was not entirely gender neutral, at least not when I worked here. Before our meetings, people frequently asked ‘Are we in Posthumus or Annie today?’

We read about the important women at the iissi. In the dissertation we find less about the history of women’s work, i.e. the history of the social phenomenon. This is attributable in part to the infrastructure. Women’s history studies were conducted at the sister institute, the iav. Your circumscription of your research period is another reason: you explore the history of the iissi until 1989. Before that time, some articles were published about women’s history in Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis. But only six years after 1989, did the VIVA database (bibliography of gender and women’s history) reach the iissi under the aegis of Jenneke Quast. Fourteen years after 1989, thanks to financing from the Friends of the iissi, the Women’s Work project was launched to conduct systematic research on work by women.

Your book Virus der betrokkenheid comprises occasional references to women’s work, including one of Posthumus delivering a lecture in 1938.

Remarkably, this lecture was also motivated by the ‘virus of involvement’ or political commitment. It was covered in the press.

Organized one evening by the Vrouwelijke Amsterdamse Studentenvereniging [Amsterdam association of women students], in this lecture, Posthumus argued against the preliminary draft bill by Romme. At the time, women employed as civil servants were already customarily dismissed from their positions, when they married. In the preliminary draft, Romme proposed prohibiting all work by married women. Posthumus harshly condemned this idea, illustrating his argument with examples from the history of women’s
work, going back to the Middle Ages to show that married women had always worked, and that this was perfectly normal. The findings arising from the evening, as published, are interesting and offer a convenient opportunity to connect them to other periods.

Posthumus reached various conclusions, arguing, for example, that the subject matter needed to be examined more extensively. He argued that married women working were not at all likely to neglect their families, as had apparently been assumed. This would usher in a male monopoly on work. Moreover, prohibiting married women from working would spell economic disaster for many families.

In his conclusions, Posthumus considered Women’s work in the 1930s. Still, these conclusions reflect striking parallels with the subject matter we addressed in the women’s work project on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We based our research on the assumption that the history of women’s work had not been examined sufficiently and concluded that of course men did not have a monopoly on work. Caring for a family by no means deterred women from doing paid work. Regardless of what standards regarding women prescribed, work by married women was economically indispensable.

In the 1930s Posthumus was very progressive. According to Huub, his views were so progressive in part thanks to his marriage to Willemijn van der Goot, one of the founders of the iav.

Ultimately, women’s history scholarship turned out to depend heavily on dedicated women scholars. The virus of involvement was indispensable.

Posthumus concluded his discourse by urging male students not to accept privileges at the expense of their female counterparts. That appeal remained equally valid in the early 1990s. At least, that was the opinion of many women who studied history. The gender bias that would seem to put men at a disadvantage for once, namely compulsory military service, once again proved unfavourable for women. Many of our dedicated fellow students opted for alternative service, which they performed at the iish.

Not only did this opportunity offer them excellent work experience at a fascinating institute: a unique benefit in an era of high unemployment and dismal career prospects, especially for history students. Many also stayed on here as tenured employees.

In the end, the balance was restored. The draft was abolished. The donation from the Friends of the iish has enabled nearly eight years of intensive research on the history of women’s work. Once again, working women and research on the history of women’s work are intertwined.

I am proud to say that the iish contributed substantially to advancing the history of women’s work in the Netherlands during the early modern period as a field of research. We published the research results, established contacts abroad, served on editorial boards. At present, the four team members continue their historical scholarship at impressive positions in higher education (the universities of Nijmegen/ Utrecht, Amsterdam and Leiden, and the junior college in Amsterdam) and have the good fortune that in most cases they can also continue to conduct research on the history of women and/or gender and even women’s work. Of course, I hope that the number of working women at the iish will increase. It would also be good, if studying gender and women in relation to work were no longer as inextricably linked to the women working at the Institute as it was at the start of the decade.

Work and love

Lecture by Mariëtte Wolf

Mariëtte Wolf is NIOD programme director for ‘Decolonisation, Violence and War in Indonesia, 1945-1950,’ also known of course (until 2002) as director of the Dutch Press Museum and acquainted with the iish. Took her PhD in 2009 on the history of De Telegraaf, Het geheim van de Telegraaf: geschiedenis van een krant.

Exactly 30 years ago, in 1989, where Huub Sanders ends his history of the iish, is where my own
history with the iish starts.

I was 24 and after taking my degree in media history the year before had started working at the Press Museum, which was still located in the East Indies House on Oude Hoogstraat. In the spring of 1989, I moved together with the entire contents of the museum to the iish, which received the collections as a long-term loan that year.

That move to the new accommodations of the iish, here at Cruquiusweg, was like travelling through time: from medieval darkness into the Enlightenment. The facilities in the new accommodations were beyond the wildest dreams of the Press Museum until then. The collection of newspapers, archives, posters, and political drawings spanning four centuries had been languishing far too long in dusty attics affected by wood rot and was hardly ever consulted. At the iish, the items were placed in repositories with optimal climate control on mobile stacks. Automated access was diligently expedited.

And all those other facilities! A spacious and comfortable reading room with an information desk and a reproduction department, a service for binding and restoring books, meeting and conference rooms, and even – albeit in limited measure – exhibition areas.

I could not believe my good fortune. Overnight, I also had 100 new co-workers, most of them exceptionally kind. I could not have hoped for a more inspiring and instructive work setting.

Within this new setting, the Press Museum could manifest as the national institution for preserving, managing, and examining 400 years of press history heritage. After the independent exposition area was opened on Zeeburgerkade, by Prince Willem Alexander in October 2001, this effort was still more successful. Given the additional developments relating to the Press Museum, which merged 2 years ago with the Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid [Image and sound institute] in Hilversum, you will understand why I feel somewhat melancholy here.

Half a year after the exposition area opened in 2001, I left this place, because I deeply missed the content of the press history heritage, for which I no longer had any time as director of the Press Museum. As an independent exhibition maker and researcher, I returned to Cruquiusweg several times over the years that followed, especially during my doctoral research on the history of De Telegraaf. Each time I was delighted to meet old acquaintances: I am referring not only to my former co-workers but also to all those politicians, journalists, and artists whose legacy is stored in this building: from Alexander Cohen to Albert Hahn, from Frits Müller to Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, from Parool woman Wim Hora Adema to courantier Wim van Norden.

After various meanderings, I have been working at the niod Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies since May 2017 – as programme director of research on the Indonesian War of Independence and the extent and context of violence committed by Dutch troops. This ambitious research programme is conducted by 25 researchers from the niod, the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde [KITLV] [Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies] and the Nederlands Instituut voor Militaire Historie [NIMH] [Dutch military history institute] and is expected to culminate in a publications series in over 3 years.

Once again, I am left with little for my own research, but coordinating research that is important for society is immensely satisfying. In addition drawing a lot of interest, the project happens to be very controversial. Not only among veterans but also with activist groups who take issue with the neo-colonial perspective of the study.

Once again, just as I felt at the iish, I greatly enjoy working with people who value exploring history without blinkers and blind spots and appreciate that historical collections are invaluable in this effort.

Previously, Huub stated that ‘the iish is not just an institute, involvement is a core value here.’ In his thesis, which I have been allowed to read before the official release, he convincingly pays tribute to this ‘virus of involvement’. Still, this involvement has a surprising dimension that Huub has unfortunately failed to address ....

This is not to be held against him, as it probably exceeds the scope of his research. I am referring to the exceptional abundance of amorous
relations that blossomed within the confines of the IISH.

In concluding my contribution, I would like to correct this omission. For the record: I speak from experience. In 1989, in the freight elevator, I encountered a co-worker who turned out to be the man of my dreams and my permanent soulmate. I am not the only one here who has chosen to spend her life with a co-worker. Looking around this room, I note that the virus of involvement has yielded similar blessings for several of those present.

I have checked the figures and find them to be still more amazing than I had expected: of the 100 to 120 staff at the IISH in the 1990s, no fewer than 32 fell in love with each other. If you like, I will be happy to give you those names and call numbers after this meeting.

Do not fear: I have counted only the amorous relationships that were open and somewhat enduring. I have not even counted secret trysts. Moreover, many of these relationships have withstood the test of time and have defied divorce statistics.

My co-workers at the NIOD – which after all is a Knaw institute that is similarly susceptible to a connecting virus – tell me that the fewer than five couples have found each other since it was established in 1945.

Based on various national surveys, about 5 to 15 % of all employees becomes involved with a co-worker, but that last percentage is most likely inflated by fleeting affairs and secret trysts. At any rate, the national percentage is considerably below the 25 to 30 % that the IISH scored in the 1990s.

This phenomenon even led former co-worker Wim Berkelaar to observe in his farewell speech in the late 1990s that the abbreviation IISG might well denote the Dutch words for International Institute for Sexual Intercourse.

I am not aware of the current state within the IISH, but it seems worthy of additional study – nor does Huub’s history enable me to estimate the number of amorous relations before 1989.

So … until additional research becomes available, we can only guess at possible explanations: the sole explanation that comes to mind after reading Huub’s dissertation is that the ghost of IISH-founder Nico Posthumus, easily ignited in fiery love, still haunts the institute.

In the 1990s the virus of involvement coincided remarkably frequently with a heart condition. I still have the IISH to thank for this life-changing disorder as well.

This House Is Not a Home: European Everyday Life in Canton and Macao 1730–1830

Lisa Hellman, Freie Universität Berlin

Lisa Hellman offers the first study of European everyday life in Canton and Macao. How foreigners could live, communicate, move around – even whom they could interact with – were all things strictly regulated by the Chinese authorities. The Europeans sometimes adapted to, and sometimes subverted, these rules.

Focusing on this conditional domesticity shows the importance of gender relations, especially the construction of masculinity. Using the Swedish East India Company, a minor European actor in an expanding Asian empire, as a point of entry highlights the multiplicity of actors taking part in local negotiations of power. The European attempts at making a home in China contributes to a global turn in everyday history, but also to an everyday turn in global history.